



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/787,122

02/27/2004

Simon Benita

0600-1125

4640

466

7590

09/10/2008

YOUNG & THOMPSON

209 Madison Street

Suite 500

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SASAN, ARADHANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/787,122 | Applicant(s) BENITA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner ARADHANA SASAN | Art Unit 1615 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ARADHANA SASAN. (3) JAY WILLIAMS.

(2) MICHAEL WOODWARD. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 04 September 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2 and 4-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kadouche et al. (US 2002/0106324 A1) and Singh et al. (Cancer Letters 84 (1994) 15-21).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's argument that Singh teaches away from using an emulsion type system is not persuasive because that may not be the best approach for improving delivery, however it still could be used. Applicant's representative will consider filing evidence that shows that emulsions are better than liposomes.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|---|---|
| /Aradhana Sasan/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615 | /MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615 |
|---|---|